

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PLAYUP, INC.,
Plaintiff(s),

v.

DR. LAILA MINTAS, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-02129-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 85]

Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion to shorten time regarding motions for protective order and to quash subpoena. Docket No. 85; *see also* Docket No. 83 (motion for protective order); Docket No. 84 (motion to quash subpoena). The Court declines to shorten time. Instead, the Court **VACATES** the deadline to respond to the subpoena. Plaintiff must immediately notify Sportradar US of this order.¹ Given the vacation of the subject deadline, there is no need to shorten time and the underlying motions will be briefed and decided in the ordinary course. Accordingly, the motion to shorten time is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 31, 2022



Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ To the extent Plaintiff receives any documents in response to the subpoena while the above motions are pending, Plaintiff may not review those documents.